

Purdue's Attempts to Coerce Taleyarkhan to Take it Quietly

At 02:12 PM 9/12/2008, Rusi Taleyarkhan wrote:

Steve,

As background, on March 17, 2008 at about noon, I was summoned to meet the interim Provost (Vic Lechtenberg) along with Larry Selander (my previous counsel). At the meeting, Lechtenberg handed me and Selander a copy of the draft report Purdue had prepared of the 2008 C-22 Inv.C (which later became the Final Report) to send to the federal govt. (ONR) for comment/corrections.

William Kealey was also present along with Peter Dunn. Lechtenberg shared that Kealey was authorized to bargain with Selander to come to terms (whatever that meant).

After that meeting, Selander met privately with Kealey for about 3 hours, after which he drove back to Chicago and while on the road, [Selander] called me from his cell phone to tell me what Purdue wanted.

Selander told me that Kealey communicated in the private meeting that Purdue had decided that the conclusions were final in terms of what Purdue was going to transmit to the external world - that is, I was to be found guilty on two counts.

Purdue wanted me to communicate with the feds that the report was complete, fair and that I was given due process and the approach Purdue used was fair and complete. If so, I would be reprimanded and offered a sabbatical leave; if not, there would be punishment depending on level of cooperation.

I was emotionally destroyed and deeply disturbed at this since by that time I had read the report and it was written like a hate-letter, dismissive of express testimony and misleading statements of fact from sworn affidavits, and with glaring omissions of fact especially the facts related to blatant discrimination, misuse of government funds, reprisal, harassment, etc. by a Purdue Head (Tsoukalas) that were all removed from dissemination to the federal government, including all of the affidavits that were problematic to Purdue.

I refused to go along with falsifying and hiding critical information for the record to the federal government and said so to Selander/Bilimoria in my March 19 letter to them.

On March 24, Kealey wrote to Selander/Bilimoria asking what position their client Taleyarkhan was to take and Kealey asked Selander to call Taleyarkhan the next day otherwise Kealey would let Purdue know that Taleyarkhan was not going to cooperate.

The next day, On March 25 Selander/Bilimoria had a long chat with Kealey and then Selander/Bilimoria tried to call me, but because I was unavailable, Selander, while he was with Bilimoria, left a voice-mail message for me at 10:48 a.m.

He said that he and Bilimoria just had a lengthy conversation with Kealey and documented what Kealey confirmed again - that is, threat of punishment for non-cooperation, the level commensurate with degree of cooperation. I have maintained the original voice-mail message on the cell phone company server also just in case.

It is important for you to know of the background (above) since it shows Purdue's counsel and representative made a deliberate attempt to coerce, intimidate and create the quid pro quo. When my counsel, John Lewis, conveyed this along with my Appeal-cum-Rebuttal package to Provost Woodson to then request that Kealey be removed from managing/judging/prosecuting the final Appeals committee, Woodson then asked Kealey to convey to us that Purdue had denied the request and Woodson issued threats of retaliation despite the letter from Lewis to Woodson to cease and desist.

Woodson then asked Bralts, the interim Head of SNE, to lie to me, effectively tricking me into coming to his office on Aug. 27 to receive the final verdict, effectively denying me the right to have the legal matters be handled by counsel and importantly, preventing me from being able to respond to press questions by prematurely releasing the final sanction letter and Appeals Committee report.

Woodson also got Purdue to issue a press release on July 18 telling the world of the Inv.C report and findings before the Appeals process could even start. Even Eugenie Reich complained. What is this if not the Provost being a cheap thug, and Purdue administration engaging in their routine reprisal and intimidation and bullying tactics? Sorry if I sound bitter and hurt.

Rusi